

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,609	07/28/2006	Satoshi Kondo	128875	9512
25944 OLIFF & BER	7590 02/09/201 PRIDGE PLC	EXAMINER		
P.O. BOX 320	850	RAHIM, MONJUR		
ALEXANDRI	A, VA 22320-4850		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2434	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/09/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

OfficeAction25944@oliff.com jarmstrong@oliff.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/587,609	KONDO ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
MONJOUR RAHIM	2434		

	MONJOUR RAHIM	2434						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress					
THE REPLY FILED 12 January 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.						
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following papilication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:     The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A on event, nowever, with the statutory period for reply expire law.	the same day as filing a Notice of, replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi all (with appeal fee) in compliance FR 1.114. The reply must be filed: date of the final rejection. dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth tetr than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or within one of the follow in the final rejection, while g date of the final rejection	which places the (3) a Request ving time chever is later. In on.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or ( MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i		FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set for thin (b) above; if checket. A vary reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filled, may reduce any sermed patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL								
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on 13 January 2010. A bri the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), o appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply</li> </ol>	or any extension thereof (37 CFR 4	1.37(e)), to avoid disr	nissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>								
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t.</li> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further cor</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belown to the properties of the properti</li></ol>	nsideration and/or search (see NO) w);	TE below);						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Notice of Non-Co	mnliant Amendment (	PTOL-324)					
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		inpliant / inonamont (i	TOL OLT,					
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the					
7. \(\subsection{\subsection}{\subsection} \) For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) \( \) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: \( \) Claim(s) allowed: \( \) Claim(s) objected to: \( \) Claim(s) rejected: \( \) Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \( \)		I be entered and an e	xplanation of					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	it or other evidence is	necessary and					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appear and was not earlier presented. Se	al and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a ).					
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.					
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
/Kambiz Zand/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2434								

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner disagrees with the Applicant's remark about qualification of prior-art (2006/0101511) used in the previous rejection. Here is why....

Examiner is not using PCT date with, rather using US FILING DATE, which is 8 January 2004. Current application claims Foreign

Examiner is not using PCT date with, rather using US FILING DATE, which is 8 January 2004. Current application claims Foreign Priority date of 5 February 2004. So, Prior-art date precedes Foreign Priority date of current application, which falls under 35 U.S.C §102(e) date (Please see MPEP 2136.03).

Also in claim 7 and 15 limitation "before receiving a program via a network" claraly taught by Grecsek ( please see Abstract). Examiner acknowledged the provided "Flowchart".